

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 have been examined. Claim 1 has been amended. New claim 21 has been added. No claims have been deleted. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hopper. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that not only is the monitor “coupled to the printer” (emphasis added), the monitor is also “operable to **provide** an indication of status associated with the printer to a microprocessor based system controller” (emphasis added). It is noted that claim 1 already recites that the microprocessor based system controller includes instructions executable by the microprocessor to “receive the indication of status associated with the printer **from the monitor**” (emphasis added).

The Office Action appears to argue that the monitor 34 of Hopper reads on the monitor of claim 1, and the printer monitor program 30 of Hopper reads on the instructions executable by the microprocessor based system controller. However, Applicants respectfully submit that this argument fails for at least two reasons.

First, the monitor 34 of Hopper is not coupled to the printers 4a and 4b (Hopper, Fig. 1). Rather, the monitor 34 is “attached to the computer 2” (Hopper, col. 3, ll. 28-29), and the computer 2 is further “in communication with [the] printers 4a and 4b over a network 6” (Hopper, col. 2, ll. 63-64). In other words, the monitor 34 of Hopper is separated from the printers 4a and 4b by at least the computer 2 and the network 6. Hence, Hopper fails to teach that the monitor 34 is “coupled to the printer” (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1.

Second, the monitor 34 of Hopper that is attached to the computer 2 appears to be a display device of the computer 2. In other words, to provide a display to a user, the monitor 34 might receive video input from the computer 2. This is opposite of the monitor of claim 1 that is

“operable to **provide** an indication of status associated with the printer to a microprocessor based system controller” (emphasis added).

Indeed, the monitor 34 of Hopper appears to be a display screen and does not “monitor” anything. In contrast, the monitor of claim 1 is not a traditional “display screen monitor,” but rather a monitor operable to actually transmit status signals based on what is monitored. Hence, Hopper also fails to teach the monitor of claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is believed to be allowable. The remaining claims depend from claim 1 and are also believed to be allowable at least by virtue of that dependence.

Claim 21

New claim 21 has been added. Claim 21 is similar to claim 1, but further recites a “paper advancement monitor.” A “paper advancement monitor” is clearly not a traditional “display screen monitor” like the monitor 34 of Hopper. Accordingly, claim 21 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites that the monitor comprises an encoder and a monitor controller. The Office Action appears to argue that the resource sensors including 16a, 18a, and 20a of Hopper read on the encoder, and that the monitor 34 of Hopper “inherently” includes a controller. However, Applicants respectfully submit that this argument fails for at least two reasons.

First, the monitor 34 of Hopper cannot include the resource sensors 16a, 18a, and 20a because the resource sensors are included in the printer 4a. As noted above, the monitor 34 of Hopper is separated from the printers 4a and 4b by at least the computer 2 and the network 6. However, the resource sensors 16a, 18a, and 20a are included in the printer 4a (Hopper, Fig. 1; col. 3, ll. 9-11). Accordingly, Hopper fails to teach that the monitor comprises the encoder.

Second, for a claim element to be “inherent” in a reference, there must be more than a possibility or probability of its presence; the description must make clear that the element is necessarily present. MPEP § 2112, Part IV. While the monitor 34 of Hopper may or could

include a controller, the monitor 34 does not necessarily have to do so. For example, the monitor 34 may be an analog monitor, for example, similar to one of the early television sets with a controller. Accordingly, the monitor 34 of Hoper does not “inherently” include a controller.

Hence, claim 2 is also believed to be allowable for at least the above reasons.

Claim 3

Claim 3 recites that “the printer is operable to **print on the sock quantity**” (emphasis added). For example, the printer might print on blank paper for producing monthly statements in some embodiments. Claim 3 also recites “determine[ing] an actual length of the **stock quantity** utilized” (emphasis added).

However, the Office Action appears to have cited passages of Hopper that are directed to printer toner as supposedly teaching limitations of claim 3. For example, Hopper describes a way to “produce the final estimate of the amount of toner that will be depleted . . . for the print job” (Hopper, col. 6, ll. 8-10). Because a printer does not print on printer toner, determinations that are related to printer toner cannot be used to teach “determine[ing] an actual length of the stock quantity utilized” as recited in claim 3.

Hence, claim 3 and its dependent claims are also believed to be allowable for at least the above reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/776,363
Amdt. dated June 17, 2008
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2008

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/darin j gibby/
Darin J. Gibby
Reg. No. 38,464

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
DJG/cl
61402527 v1